UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,407	10/31/2003	Kuo-Juei Peng	252011-1760	2106
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP 600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, 15TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			FISHER, MICHAEL J	
ATLANTA, GA 30339			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/699,407	PENG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MICHAEL J. FISHER	3689				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
· <u> </u>						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) -4,8,11,12,15-19,23,26,27,29-34,38,41,42,44,45 and 53 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,8,11,12,15-19,23,26,27,29-34,38,41,42,44,45 and 53 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4,8,11,12,15-19,23,26,27,29-34,38,41,42,44,45 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PAT 7,237,266 to Aaron.

As to claims 1,16,31, Aaron discloses a computerized reliability assessment system (title) with an interface to receive input items that are selected (software in the computer), which software is inherently on a "semiconductor product", an assessment engine (206), and generates a result and displays this on the interface (the software running the computer, computer, figs 6A and 6B). Aaron does not, however, specifically mention the manufacturing process as being assessed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the manufacturing process as an assessment item as the process could produce faulty chips and without using the process in the

system, it would be much more difficult to find out why a system keeps failing the assessment if the manufacturing process is the cause and it is not assessed.

As to claim 53, Aaron discloses a computerized reliability assessment system (title) with a first interface to receive input items (software in the computer), a second interface is assessment engine (206), and generates a result and displays this on the interface (the software running the computer, computer, figs 6A and 6B).

As to claims 2,17,32, the interface is a web-based interface (214, 104, as best seen in fig 2).

As to claims 3,18,33, there is a database for storing the data (208).

As to claims 4,19,34, there is an email server (col 9, lines 56-59).

As to claims 21, the result is generated (inherently as the reliability is assessed).

As to claims 11,26,41, determining early failure is one of the purposes of the system (col 1, lines 23-29).

As to claims 12,27,42 the input inherently comprises technology (the system is for electronic products) and specifications (inherent in that the specifications are needed to study the product).

As to claims 43, Aaron does not specifically teach the system as being for a semiconductor. Aaron does, however, teach using it for electronic products, which group includes semiconductor products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system for a semiconductor product as it is shown to be useful for electronic products.

Art Unit: 3689

As to claims 8,23 and 38, as best understood, there is human computer interaction (abstract, line 8).

As to claims 14,29,44, the "technology" is inherently the geometry of the product, as the geometry affects the working of the product.

As to claims 15, 30,45, Aaron further teaches assessing the lifetime of the product (failure being the end of the lifetime) but does not specifically mention voltage. However, as the product is an electronic product, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the voltage of the product as electronic products use electricity and the voltage can affect the lifetime.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. A computer system is a "semiconductor item" and therefore, checking its reliability meets the limitations as claimed. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., The "assessment items" are received and used, not "provided for assisting user input") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The "assessment items" are received via the network and used. Which aspect of the system is being assessed is not important unless

Art Unit: 3689

claimed as such and the limitations as claimed do not do so. The information retrieval manners are not different, they search for terms that are included.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL J. FISHER whose telephone number is (571)272-6804. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,407 Page 6

Art Unit: 3689

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MF 5/12/08

/Janice A. Mooneyham/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689 Application Number

Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination		
10/699,407	PENG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MICHAEL LEISHER	3689		